



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,029	08/18/2003	Christopher D. Smith	555255012441	3221
89441	7590	09/04/2009		
Jones Day (RIM) - 2N			EXAMINER	
North Point			DARNO, PATRICK A	
901 Lakeside Avenue				
Cleveland, OH 44114			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2158	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/04/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

dlpejeau@jonesday.com
portfolioprosecution@rim.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/643,029	SMITH, CHRISTOPHER D.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	PATRICK A. DARNO	2158

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2009.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 and 54-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17 and 54-66 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 18 August 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04032009
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 62-66 are new. Claims 18-53 are canceled. Claims 1, 54, and 64 have been amended. Claims 1-17 and 54-66 are pending in this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-14, 16-17, and 54-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,980,817 issued to Albert Chow et al. (hereinafter "Chow") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0065738 issued Victor Shiang Yang et al. (hereinafter "Yang") and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0087300 issued to John Ervin Lewis (hereinafter "Lewis").

Claim 1:

Chow discloses a system for triggering a provision event in a service provider using a provisioning request message stored in a computer-readable medium generated by an external system (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6*), comprising:

a provisioning system operable to electronically receive the provisioning request message from the external system and transmit information in the provisioning request message to the service provider to trigger the provisioning event, wherein the provisioning system is separate from the external system and the service provider (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6 and column 10, lines 28-36*), and wherein the provisioning events include activation of

a service (*Chow: column 10, lines 32-36 and column 14, lines 9-21*) and gathering of status information associated with a service (*Chow: column 8, lines 61-64 and column 14, lines 9-21*);

the provisioning request message including an entity to which the provisioning event pertains, wherein the identifying information includes one or more attributes defined by the external system (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6 and column 10, lines 28-36*);

a provisioning reply (*Chow: column 14, lines 41-54*);

the provisioning system in communication with the external system and the service provider, wherein the service provider is operable to communicate with the entity to cause the provisioning event to occur in response to receiving the provisioning request message from the provisioning system (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6 and column 10, lines 28-36*);

the service provider operable to provide mobile communication service to the entity (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6 and column 10, lines 28-36*).

Chow fails to explicitly disclose wherein the provisioning request message is an electronic message having a data structure; and wherein provisioning events include deactivation of service, suspension of service, resumption of service, and gathering of status information associated with the service.

However, Yang discloses wherein the provisioning request message being a format-independent electronic message capable of being constructed by and interpreted by any external system and having a data structure (*Yang: paragraph [0051] and paragraph [0047]; The trigger message is the provisioning request message. The XML trigger message is equivalent to the claimed format-independent*

electronic provisioning request message. This will be further expanded upon in the Examiner's response to argument below.); and wherein provisioning events include deactivation of service, suspension of service, resumption of service (Yang: paragraphs [0023], [0024], [0027], [0107], and [0109]; Suspension and resumption of service is essentially "activating" and "deactivating" service. These operations listed appear to be redundant in view of activation and deactivation.), and gathering of status information associated with the service [Yang: paragraph [0045], lines 7-18 and paragraph [0046]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Chow with the teachings of Yang noted above. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the invention of Chow with the teachings of Yang noted above in order to help establish a method of updating services received from a service provider without first requiring a request from a user (Yang: paragraph [0035]). This would ensure the user of having the assurance and stability of knowing that the applications and services being used on his mobile device are always current and up-to-date.

The combination of Yang and Chow fails to expressly disclose wherein the provisioning system uses the provisioning reply to return status information or error information relating to the provisioning request message to the external system.

However, Lewis discloses a provisioning reply, wherein the provisioning system uses the provisioning reply to return status information or error information relating to the provisioning request message to the external system (Lewis: paragraphs [0252], [0306], [0441], [0492], and [0526]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the previously mentioned combination with the teachings of Lewis noted above. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the previously mentioned

combination such that a user could be notified that a specific, attempted operation has not been successful (*Lewis: paragraph [306]*).

Claim 2:

The combination of Chow, Yang, and Lewis discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Chow further discloses wherein the one or more attributes include a name attribute that identifies the entity (*Chow: column 13, lines 59-64; Note that the point-of-sale information includes the subscriber name.*).

Claim 3:

The combination of Yang, Chow, and Lewis discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Lewis discloses wherein the one or more attributes include a type attribute that identifies an entity type of the entity (*Lewis: paragraph [0121], lines 5-9*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the previously mentioned combination with the teachings of Lewis noted above for the purpose of including a destination device type inside a provisioning request (*Lewis: paragraph [0121], lines 5-9 and paragraph [0127], lines 1-5; First note that the routing information contains a device type. Then note that the routing information is part of the overall provisioning message to be sent.*). The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the previously mentioned combination per the above such that the destination device type would aid in the delivery process of the provisioning request (*Lewis: paragraph [0151], lines 5-8*).

Claim 4:

The combination of Chow, Yang, and Lewis discloses all the elements of claim 3, as noted above, and Lewis further discloses wherein the type attribute identifies a model number of the entity (*Lewis: paragraph [0361], lines 1-4; The mobile identification number is the model number.*).

Claim 5:

The combination of Chow, Yang, and Lewis discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Chow further discloses wherein the service provider is a mobile data service provider (*Chow: column 2, line 47 – column 3, line 3*).

Claim 6:

The combination of Chow, Yang, and Lewis discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Chow further discloses wherein the provisioning request message further includes provisioning data that identifies a particular entity to which the provisioning event pertains (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6; See at least the unique electronic serial identification number (MSID).*).

Claim 7:

The combination of Chow, Yang, and Lang discloses all the elements of claim 6, as noted above, and Chow further discloses wherein the particular entity is a mobile communication device (*Chow: column 13, line 52 – column 14, line 6 and column 2, lines 43-46; The mobile station (MS) is the mobile communication device.*).

Claim 8:

The combination of Chow, Yang, and Lewis discloses all the elements of claim 6, as noted above, and Chow further discloses wherein the provisioning data includes one or more

attributes defined by the external system (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6; The attributes defined by the external system include subscriber name, address, credit card number, unique mobile station identification number (MSID), optional personal identification number (PIN) and other verification numbers.*).

Claim 9:

The combination of Chow, Yang, and Lewis discloses all the elements of claim 8, as noted above, and Chow further discloses wherein the one or more attributes include a name attribute that identifies a type of information included within the provisioning data (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6; See at least subscriber name.*).

Claim 10:

The combination of Chow, Yang, and Lewis discloses all the elements of claim 9, as noted above, and Chow further discloses wherein the type of information included within the provisioning data includes a personal identification number (PIN) for the entity (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6; See at least personal identification number (PIN).*).

Claim 11:

The combination of Chow, Yang, and Lewis discloses all the elements of claim 9, as noted above, and Chow further discloses wherein the type of information included within the provisioning data includes a product identifier for the entity (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6; See at least the unique mobile station identification number (MSID).*).

Claim 12:

The combination of Chow, Yang, and Lewis discloses all the elements of claim 9, as noted above, and Chow further discloses wherein the type of information included within the

provisioning data includes a billing identifier for the entity (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6; See at least the credit card number.*).

Claim 13:

The combination of Chow, Yang, and Lewis discloses all the elements of claim 9, as noted above, and Chow further discloses wherein the type of information included within the provisioning data includes an international mobile subscriber identity identifier (IMSI) for the entity (*Chow: column 14, lines 29-31*).

Claim 14:

The combination of Chow and Yang discloses all the elements of claim 9, as noted above, but the previously mentioned combination does not explicitly disclose wherein the type of information included within the provisioning data includes a mobile subscriber integrated services digital network number (MSISDN) for the entity.

However, Lewis discloses wherein the type of information included within the provisioning data includes a mobile subscriber integrated services digital network number (MSISDN) for the entity (*Lewis: paragraph [0388], lines 1-6 and paragraph [0319]*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the previously mentioned combination with the teachings of Lewis noted above. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the previously mentioned combination per the above such that the MSISDN could be used to indicate the mobile directory number for a particular device (*Lewis: paragraph [0388], lines 1-6 and paragraph [0319]*).

Claim 16:

The combination of Chow and Yang discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and but the previously mentioned combination does not explicitly disclose wherein the provisioning request message includes additional information identifying one or more additional entities to which the provisioning event pertains, and wherein the additional information includes one or more attributes defined by the external system.

However, Lewis discloses wherein the provisioning request message includes additional information identifying one or more additional entities to which the provisioning event pertains, and wherein the additional information includes one or more attributes defined by the external system (*Lewis: paragraphs [0172] and [0173]; These references disclose sending provisioning requests to multiple or additional users. The multiple users are taken from a distribution list and all the users receive the same messages. Further additional users can be added to any list. Further for each additional user device type, destination address, and all other attributes are included in the message (this is equivalent to the provisioning entity and provisioning data item sections).*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the previously mentioned combination with the teachings of Lewis noted above. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the previously mentioned combination per the above such that a single message would contain routing information for multiple devices (*Lewis: paragraph [0121], lines 1-5*).

Claim 17:

The combination of Chow, Yang, and Lewis discloses all the elements of claim 16, as noted above, and Lewis further discloses wherein a data structure relationship between the

provisioning entity section and the one or more additional provisioning entity sections is defined by the external system (*Lewis: paragraphs [0172]-[0173]; The distribution list on the external system creates the data structure relationship between the additional entities.*).

Claim 54:

Claim 54 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1.

Claim 55:

The combination of Chow, Yang, and Lewis discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Yang further discloses wherein the electronic message is an extensible markup language (XML) message (*Yang: paragraph [0051], lines 8-12*).

Claim 56:

Claim 56 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 1 and 55.

Claims 57-61:

The addition of claims 57-61 is noted. However, claims 57-61 are rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 62:

The combination of Chow, Yang, and Lewis discloses all the elements of claim 57, as noted above, and Yang further discloses wherein the status information describing the status of the provisioning system entity includes: service deactivated, service deactivated after modification, service suspended, service activated, service activated via handheld, and service activated via request (*Yang: paragraphs [0023], [0024], [0027], [0045], lines 7-18, [0046], [0107], and [0109]*).

Claim 63:

The combination of Chow, Yang, and Lewis discloses all the elements of claim 58, as noted above, and Lewis further discloses wherein the error information describing the error that occurred includes: success, service already active, service not suspended, service deactivated, service suspended, no line items found, insufficient permission to request activation, insufficient permission to request activation/modification, insufficient permission to request suspend, insufficient permission to request resume, invalid data: missing billing identifier, invalid data: insufficient input, invalid request: service inactive/service not found in database, invalid data: missing IMSI, invalid data: missing input information, length must satisfy range, must belong to set, must satisfy both length range and content format, internal error: please contact product support, invalid data: requestor resolved to other, invalid data: requestor not found, and system error: please try again later [*Lewis: paragraphs [0252], [0306], [0441], [0492], and [0526]*].

Claim 64:

Claim 64 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 62.

Claim 65:

Claim 65 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 63.

Claim 66:

Chow discloses a system, comprising:
a processor [*Chow: column 9, lines 52-57*];
a computer-readable storage medium containing instructions operable to cause the processor to perform operations [*Chow: column 11, lines 37-44*] including:

receiving at a provisioning system, a provisioning request message generated by an external system, and wherein the provisioning request message identifies a particular entity and includes a provisioning reply and one or more performable actions (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6 and column 10, lines 28-36; The purchasing entity is identified by at least the "subscriber name".*);

wherein, after receiving the provisioning request message, the provisioning system uses the provisioning request message to verify the identity of the external system [*Chow: column 14, line 14; Note that verification is carried out using the "point-of-sale" information. The "point-of-sale" information is the provisioning request message.*], and the provisioning system sends an acknowledgement to the external system indicating successful receipt of the provisioning request message [*Chow: column 14, lines 14-21*];

wherein, after verifying the identity of the external system, the provisioning system transmits the received provisioning request message to a service provider operable to process the provisioning request message (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6 and column 10, lines 28-36*) and to provide mobile communication service to the entity (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6 and column 10, lines 28-36*);

wherein, after the provisioning system transmits the received provisioning request message to the service provider, the service provider processes the provisioning request message (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6 and column 10, lines 28-36*);

wherein after the external system has received the provisioning reply, the external system verifies the identity of the provisioning system [*Chow: column 13, line 52, column 14, line 21; The process here clearly shows the interaction between the external system [retail provider], provisioning request [point*

of sale information], user [buyer of mobile device] and service provider [service provider]. The message is passed between the entities and activation takes place. Surely the identities of each party have been "verified."];

wherein, after verifying the identity of the provisioning system, the external system takes action based upon the contents of the reply message [*Chow: column 13, line 52, column 14, line 21; The process here clearly shows the interaction between the external system [retail provider], provisioning request [point of sale information], user [buyer of mobile device] and service provider [service provider]. The message is passed between the entities and activation takes place. Surely the identities of each party have been "verified."*].

Chow fails to expressly disclose wherein the provisioning request message is a format-independent electronic message capable of being constructed and interpreted by any external system, wherein the provisioning request message is capable of specifying a request to provision entities on multiple systems using multiple schemes for identifying an entity.

However, Yang discloses wherein the provisioning request message is format-independent electronic message capable of being constructed and interpreted by any external system, wherein the provisioning request message is capable of specifying a request to provision entities on multiple systems using multiple schemes for identifying an entity (*Yang: paragraph [0051] and paragraph [0047]; The trigger message is the provisioning request message. The XML trigger message is equivalent to the claimed format-independent electronic provisioning request message. This will be further expanded upon in the Examiner's response to argument below.*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Chow with the teachings of Yang noted above. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the invention of Chow with the teachings of Yang noted above in order to help establish a method of updating services received from a service

provider without first requiring a request from a user (*Yang: paragraph [0035]*). This would ensure the user of having the assurance and stability of knowing that the applications and services being used on his mobile device are always current and up-to-date.

The combination of Chow and Yang fails to expressly disclose wherein, after the provisioning request message has been processed by the service provider, the provisioning system transmits the provisioning reply, including status information or error information, to the external system.

However, Lewis discloses wherein, after the provisioning request message has been processed by the service provider, the provisioning system transmits the provisioning reply, including status information or error information to the external system (*Lewis: paragraphs [0252], [0306], [0441], [0492], and [0526]*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the previously mentioned combination with the teachings of Lewis noted above. The skilled artisan would have motivated to improve the previously mentioned combination such that a user could be notified that a specific, attempted operation has not been successful (*Lewis: paragraph [306]*).

3. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chow in view of Yang in view of Lewis and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0058652 issued to Christopher M. McGregor et al. (hereinafter “McGregor”).

Claim 15:

The combination of Chow, Yang, and Lewis discloses all the elements of claim 9, as noted above, but the previously mentioned combination does not explicitly disclose wherein the type of information included within the provisioning data includes an integrated circuit card identifier (ICCID) for the entity. However, McGregor discloses wherein the provisioning data includes an integrated circuit card identifier (ICCID) for the entity (*McGregor: paragraph [0201]*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the previously mentioned combination with the teachings of McGregor noted above. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the previously mentioned combination per the above such that the ICCID could be used to identify a particular mobile device (*McGregor: paragraph [0201], at least lines 3-7*).

Response to Arguments

Examiner's Comments with Respect to Interview Held 08/28/2009

There have been numerous interviews held with respect to the prosecution of this Application. In addition to the interview held 08/28/2009, a prior interview was held 04/24/2009. There have been occasions in these interviews where the Applicant's representative sets forth compelling arguments which respect to how the claimed invention may differentiate over the prior art of record. However, it is noted that these arguments and/or general comments are not part of the record. The Examiner particularly brought this issue to the attention of Applicant's representative in the interview on 08/28/2009.

In order for any or all of these arguments to carry significant weight in the prosecution of the instant application, these arguments need to be provided in writing, on the record. Until that occurs, such arguments/comments will be given little weight in the prosecution of the instant application. See 37 C.F.R. 1.2.

Finally, this is not an admission that any or all of the arguments set forth by the Applicant's representative in said interviews would immediately render the instant case allowable if set forth on the record. But the arguments would help develop the proper scope of the claims, and further assert precisely how the claimed invention could potentially differentiate from the prior art. Such development on the written record is critical to the prosecution of any patent application.

Examiner Comments with Respect to the Prior Art

Applicant's independent claims recite limitations claiming "a format-independent electronic message". At least one or more independent claims recite that this "format-independent message" is capable of specifying a request "using multiple schemes". The Examiner asserts that this is simply an XML message. And, as cited above, the Yang reference discloses an XML message.

The prior art clearly defines XML has being a "format-independent electronic message". U.S. Patent Application Publication 2009/0177350 claiming a priority date of March 14, 2001 recites that messages are coded in an "application-independent format such as...XML" [2009/0177350: paragraph [0042], lines 3-4]. Furthermore, U.S. Patent Number 7,111,077 claiming a priority date of Dec. 22, 2000 recites that XML is a "middle-ware independent message interchange format" [7,111,077: column 4, lines 18-23].

These references act as evidence in support of the Examiner's interpretation that XML messages, in and of themselves, are "format-independent electronic messages." This position taken by the Examiner is clearly supported by the prior art.

As a result, the claims remain rejected under the reasons set forth in the preceding office action.

Applicant Argues:

The Applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Chow, Yang, Lewis and McGregor, alone or in combination, do not teach or disclose the limitations recited in claim 1, as amended. Thus, the applicant further submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

The applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Chow, Yang, Lewis, and McGregor, alone or in combination, do not teach or disclose the limitations recited in claim 61, as amended.

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. The rejection of claim 1 is set forth on pages 2-5 of the instant office action. The rejection will not be regurgitated here. Claim 61 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1. Examiner notes that the Applicant failed to point out specific errors in the Examiner's office action in writing. This is required under 37 C.F.R. 1.111(b) and 37 C.F.R. 1.2. A determination for potential allowance of the claims cannot be made until potential errors or deficiencies in the Examiner's rejections are pointed out on the record.

Until such errors or deficiencies in the rejection are pointed out in writing, on the record, the rejections given in the preceding office action are presumed valid.

Contact Information

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PATRICK A. DARNO whose telephone number is (571)272-0788. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ali can be reached on (571) 272-4105. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mohammad Ali/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2158

/Patrick A. Darno/
Examiner
Art Unit 2158
08-31-2009

PAD